DEC. 1, 2005 10:25AM EDWARDS LEGAL DEPT. 949-250-6885

NO. 3111 P. 4/6

Attorney Docket: RMI-5723 CON2

(formerly 271/094)

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 and 6-12 remain pending in this case. Claim 11 remains withdrawn, Claim 8

has been amended. Reconsideration of the rejections set forth in the Office Action mailed

September 2, 2005, is respectfully requested.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite. Applicant has amended

Claim 8 to depend now depend from Claim 3 which provides the proper antecedent basis to place

Claim 8 in condition for allowance. Accordingly, Applicant requests that the rejection of Claim

8 be withdrawn.

Art Rejections

Claims 1-3, 6-10, and 12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly

unpatentable over Tsugita (USPN 5,911,734) in view of Barbut (USPN 5,662,671). Claim 3 was

rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over Tsugita in view of Barbut

and further in view of Bajaj (USPN 5,053,008). Claim 9 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

as being allegedly unpatentable over Tsugita in view of Kletschka (USPN 4,794,928). The

rejections are overcome as follows.

Applicant respectfully requests that the Tsugita reference be disqualified as prior art

under 35 U.S.C. 103(c). The present application and the Tsugita patent (USPN 5,911,734) were,

at the time the invention of the present application was made, owned by Embol-X, Inc.

As the Examiner has noted the Tsugita reference can only constitute prior art under 35

U.S.C. 102(e). Thus, since the Tsugita reference is used as a 35 U.S.C. 103(a) reference, the

Tsugita patent must be disqualified as prior art. (MPEP 706.02(1)(1) and 706.02(1)(2))

Attorney Docket: RMI-5723 CON2

(formerly 271/094)

Accordingly, independent Claim 1 is allowable. Claims 2, 3, 6-10 and 12 depend from Claim 1 and are therefore allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1.

## FEES DUE TO FILE THIS AMENDMENT

The aforementioned claim additions and/or cancellations have not resulted in more than the original number of claims, and thus no claim fees are believed to be due to file this amendment.

DEC. 1. 2005 10:26AM

Attorney Docket: RMI-5723 CON2 (formerly 271/094)

44,881

## CONCLUSION

For the above reasons, pending Claims 1-3, 6-10 and 12 are in condition for allowance and allowance of the application is hereby solicited. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns, a telephone call to the undersigned at 949-250-6856 is welcomed and encouraged.

Date: 12/1/05

Melt 14

Theodore Lopez, Reg N

Edwards Lifesciences LK

Law Department

One Edwards Way Irvine, California 92614

Telephone: (949) 250-6856 Facsimile: (949) 250-6850

Customer No. 30452